

**SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

SUBJECT: Professional Services: PS-3556-08/JVP - Engineering Study and Design Services for CR 419 - Snow Hill Road to the Orange County Line

DEPARTMENT: Administrative Services

DIVISION: Purchasing and Contracts

AUTHORIZED BY: Frank Raymond

CONTACT: Jacqui Perry

EXT: 7114

MOTION/RECOMMENDATION:

Approve ranking list and authorize staff to negotiate rates for PS-3556-08/JVP - Engineering Study and Design Services for CR 419 - Snow Hill Road to the Orange County Line with Professional Engineering Consultants, Orlando, Florida (Estimated Usage Amount of \$1,400,000.00 over the term of the Agreement).

County-wide

Ray Hooper

BACKGROUND:

PS-3556-08/JVP - Engineering Study and Design Services for CR 419 - Snow Hill Road to the Orange County Line will provide for engineering and design services as described in the detailed Scope of Services.

The project was publicly advertised and the County received twenty-six (26) submittals (listed alphabetically:

- Bowyer Singleton & Associates
- C3TS, P.A.
- Comprehensive Engineering Services
- CH2M HILL
- Consul-Tech Transportation, Inc.
- CPH Engineers, Inc
- Denham Summitt Engineering LLC
- DRMP, Inc
- Engineering & Environmental Design, Inc
- Envisors, LLC
- Franklin, Hart & Reid/KZF
- Ghyabi & Associates, Inc
- HDR Engineering, Inc.
- Horizon Engineering Group, Inc.
- Inwood Consulting Engineers, Inc.
- Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.
- Kimley-Horn & Assoc. Inc
- Lochrane Engineering, Inc
- LPA Group Inc.
- PEC (Professional Engineering Consultants)
- Metric Engineering, Inc.

- Miller Legg
- Moffatt & Nichol
- URS
- Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
- Wilbur Smith Associates, Inc.

The Evaluation Committee, which consisted of Brett Blackadar, Principal Engineer, Public Works - Engineering; Jerry McCollum, County Engineer, Public Works; Shad Smith, Principal Engineer, Public Works - Traffic Engineering; and Gary Johnson, Public Works Director (Excused), evaluated the submittals and agreed to shortlist three (3) firms. The Evaluation Committee (minus Mr. Johnson) interviewed these firms giving consideration to the following criteria:

- Project Approach
- Qualifications of Proposed Team
- Innovation

The attached backup documentation includes the Bid Tabulation, the Presentation Summary & Scoring Sheets, the Evaluation Summary Sheet and the Project Scope. The Evaluation Committee recommends that the Board approve the ranking below and authorize staff to negotiate rates with the top ranked firm in accordance with F.S. 287.055, the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA):

- PEC (Professional Engineering Consultants)
- Metric Engineering
- URS

Staff will return to present the final negotiated rates and the Award Agreement for approval and execution by the Board. Authorization for the performance of services by the Consultant under this Agreement shall be in the form of written Work Orders issued and executed by the County, and signed by the Consultant. The work and dollar amount for each Work Order shall be negotiated on an as-needed basis for this project, within approved budget amounts. Funds are identified in Engineering; Roads - CR 419 (Account #077541.560670, CIP #00198102).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Board approve ranking list and authorize staff to negotiate rates for PS-3556-08/JVP - Engineering Study and Design Services for CR 419 - Snow Hill Road to the Orange County Line with Professional Engineering Consultants, Orlando, Florida (Estimated Usage Amount of \$1,400,000.00 over the term of the Agreement).

ATTACHMENTS:

1. PS-3556-08_JVP - Backup Documentation

Additionally Reviewed By:

☐ County Attorney Review (Ann Colby)

**B.C.C. - SEMINOLE COUNTY, FL
PS TABULATION SHEET**

PS NUMBER: PS-3556-08/JVP

PS TITLE : Engineering and Design
Services for CR 419 from Snowhill Rd
To the Orange County Line

ALL SUBMITTALS ACCEPTED BY SEMINOLE COUNTY ARE SUBJECT TO THE COUNTY'S TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND ANY AND ALL ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PROPOSERS ARE REJECTED AND SHALL HAVE NO FORCE AND EFFECT. PS DOCUMENTS FROM THE PROPOSERS LISTED HEREIN ARE THE ONLY SUBMITTALS RECEIVED TIMELY AS OF THE ABOVE OPENING DATE AND TIME. ALL OTHER PS DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION, IF ANY, ARE HEREBY REJECTED AS LATE.

DATE: July 24, 2008 TIME: 2:00 P.M.

RESPONSE -1-	RESPONSE -2-	RESPONSE -3-	RESPONSE -4-
Bowyer Singleton & Associates 520 S. Magnolia Avenue Orlando, FL 32801 Kevin Knudsen, P.E. (407) 843-5120 – Phone (407) 649-8664 - Fax	C3TS, P.A. 11315 Corporate Blvd. STE 105 Orlando, FL 32817 Walfrido Pevida, P.E. (407) 823-8966 – Phone (407) 823-8826 – Fax	Comprehensive Engineering Services 201 S. Orange Ave, Ste 100 Orlando, FL 32801 Christopher A. Simoneaux, P.E. (407) 432-1600 – Phone (407) 423-9614 - Fax	CH2M HILL 225 E. Robinson, Suite 505 Orlando, FL 32801-4321 Mark S. Callahan (407) 423-0300 – Phone (407) 839-5901 – Fax
RESPONSE -5-	RESPONSE -6-	RESPONSE -7-	RESPONSE -8-
Consul-Tech Transportation, Inc. 2828 Edgewater Drive Orlando, FL 32804 Ralph Byrd, P.E. (407) 649-8334 – Phone (407) 649-8190 – Fax	CPH Engineers, Inc 500 W Fulton St Sanford, FL 32771 David A. Gierach, P.E. (407) 322-6841 – Phone (407) 330-0639 – Fax	Denham Summitt Engineering LLC 3667 Simonton Place Lake Mary, FL 32746 Geoff Summitt (407) 323-0705 – Phone (407) 264-6901 – Fax	DRMP, Inc 941 Lake Baldwin Ln Orlando, FL 32814 Mark D. Prochak, P.E. (407) 896-0594 – Phone (407) 896-4836 – Fax
RESPONSE -9-	RESPONSE -10-	RESPONSE -11-	RESPONSE -12-
Engineering & Environmental Design, Inc 940 North Ferncreek Avenue Orlando, FL 32803 Larry T. Ray, PE (407) 650-0006 – Phone (407) 648-8338 - Fax	Envisors, LLC 2466 W SR 426, Ste 1010 Oviedo, FL 32765 Steven C. Shealey, P.E. (407) 706-1782 – Phone (407) 671-0072 – Fax	Franklin, Hart & Reid/KZF 1368 E. Vine Street Kissimmee, FL 34744 David A. Reid, PE (407) 846-1216 – Phone (407) 343-0324 - Fax	Ghyabi & Associates, Inc 1660 Prudential Dr. Suite 202 Jacksonville, FL 32207 Ralph Byrd III 904-396-5727 – Phone 904-396-5737 - Fax

RESPONSE -13-	RESPONSE -14-	RESPONSE -15-	RESPONSE -16-
HDR Engineering, Inc. 315 E. Robinson St. Ste 400 Orlando, FL 32801 Steven Ferrell, P.E. (407) 420-4200 – Phone (407) 420-4242 – Fax	Horizon Engineering Group, Inc. 2500 Maitland Center Pkwy, Ste 300 Maitland, FL 32751 Jerry C. Warren (407) 644-7755 – Phone (407) 644-7855 - Fax	Inwood Consulting Engineers, Inc. 870 Clark Street Oviedo, FL 32765 Andrew DeWitt, P.E., (407) 971-8850 – Phone (407) 971-8955 - Fax	Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. 1000 Legion Place, Suite 1400 Orlando, FL 32801 Bob Cortelyou, PE (407) 514-1400 – Phone (407) 514-1499 - Fax
RESPONSE -17-	RESPONSE -18-	RESPONSE -19-	RESPONSE -20-
Kimley-Horn & Assoc. Inc 3660 Maguire Blvd., Ste 200 Orlando, FL 32803 Kim Elmer, P.E. (407) 898-1511 – Phone (407) 894-4791 – Fax	Lochrane Engineering, Inc 201 South Bumby Avenue Orlando, FL 32803 Donald Graham, P.E. (407) 896-3317 – Phone (407) 896-9167 – Fax	LPA Group Inc. 615 Crescent Executive Court, Ste 200 Lake Mary, FL 32746-2146 Manuch Amir, P.E. (407) 306-0200 – Phone (407) 306-0460 – Fax	PEC 200 E. Robinson St. Ste 1560 Orlando, FL 32801 Michael Mohler, P.E. (407) 422-8062 – Phone (407) 849-9401 – Fax
RESPONSE -21-	RESPONSE -22-	RESPONSE -23-	RESPONSE -24-
Metric Engineering, Inc. 615 Crescent Executive Court, Ste 524 Lake Mary, FL 32746 C. Brian Fuller, P.E. (407) 644-1898 – Phone (407) 644-1921 - Fax	Miller Legg 631 S. Orlando Ave. #200 Winter Park, FL 32789 Jon Walls, RLA (407) 629-8880 – Phone (407) 629-7883 – Fax	Moffatt & Nichol 1025 Greenwood Blvd, Ste 371 Lake Mary, FL 32746 Rhet L. Schmidt, P.E. (407) 562-2030 – Phone (407) 562-2031 – Fax	URS 315 E. Robinson St. Ste 245 Orlando, FL 32801 Stephen Noppinger, P.E. (407) 422-0353 – Phone (407) 423-2695 – Fax
RESPONSE -25-	RESPONSE -26-	RESPONSE --	RESPONSE --
Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. 225 E. Robinson St., Ste 300 Orlando, FL 32801 Mark Bertoncini, P.E. (407) 839-4006 – Phone (407) 839-4008 – Fax	Wilbur Smith Associates, Inc. 3191 Maguire Blvd., Ste. 200 Orlando, FL 32803 Adrian B. Share, P.E. (407) 896-5851 – Phone (407) 896-9165 – Fax	“BLANK”	“BLANK”

Tabulated by Jacqui Perry, CPPB – Posted July 24, 2008 (2 pm)

Short-listing Evaluation Committee Meeting: August 27, 2008 at 9:30am.
Wekiva Conference Room, 520 W. Lake Mary Blvd, Sanford, Florida 32773.

Evaluation Criteria: Project Approach/Understanding of Project (40%)
Similar recent project experience (20%)
Project Team Qualifications (20%)
Innovative cost saving ideas (15%)
Location of Firm (5%)

Page 3 of 3

Short listed Firms: Metric Engineering; URS, PEC (Re-posted on August 27, 2008 @ 11:45am)

Presentations: September 30, 2008 -1:30-4:30 PM

Presentation Results: **1. PEC 2. Metric Engineering 3. URS**

Board of County Commissioners Agenda Date – Phase 1 Ranking and Negotiation: October 28, 2008

Board of County Commissioners Agenda Date – Award: TBD

PRESENTATION RANKINGS - PS-3556-08/JVP
Engineering and Design Services for CR 419-Snow Hill Rd to the Orange County Line

	B. Blackadar	J. McCollum	S. Smith	TOTAL POINTS	RANKING
PEC	1	1	1	3	1
METRIC ENGINEERING	2	2	2	6	2
URS	3	3	3	9	3

The Evaluation Committee agrees to the following ranking:

- 1 PEC
- 2 Metric Engineering
- 3 URS


 Brett Blackadar


 Shad Smith


 Jerry McCollum

**PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill
Road to the Orange County Line**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: PEC

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Shad Smith

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

30% Plans + 30% MAPS Brought, LOTS OF COORDINATION
Met w/ DC Traffic Interconnect. D.D And TIFT Easement
Snow Hill accidents mentioned. Detail Row such of last Dept of Record.
Excellent Flood Plain Map. Traffic Analysis with Projections, Proposed signals
Typical options Good. Excellent land use Map.
Urban 5 Lane section - Urban Boundary - Some wall.
Excellent Drainage Detail. R
Chulvota Design Standards, Excellent understanding of Locals

Score 58
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

PEC, HHI, GMB,
46A Phase II & III, Red Bug Sand Lake Rd.
No one from Traffic team at Presentation.
Team did a lot of work, Southeastern not mentioned.
Excellent PM

Score 17
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Do Row + Control up Front. Split phase at L4 mills
River Run Church use PDI County Prop. Pond. All wet.
Landscaping, Retention Pond as a Park
Re use Exist Right. Roadside Landscape Buffer in xch of Row

Score 17
(0-20)

Ranking 1

Total Score (0-100) 92

**PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill
Road to the Orange County Line**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Metric Engineering, Inc

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Shad Smith

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

Schedule 6 mo. 2 Segments. Already collected Data Provided Proj. Info Packet
Detailed Traffic Analysis. Excellent Cost Breakout.
Typicals Standard approach. South seg. 24' set aside for Trail
Access Mgmt - List Locations.
Covered TCP, Public Inv. Good. Excellent QA/QC.
Mention of sensitive nature of Aquatic life S.
Drainage Approach Good. 4 Basins, Preliminary Pond Sizing good
w/ Ed B. + Ems, limited detail of Responder answers.

Score 54
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

JMT + Metric, GMB. Brian Keller PM. John Flora Pcl. org. Leader
Southeastern, Ed Bartolo, GEC. Excellent Team.
Global S. Local. Excellent similar project experience
and strong team.

Score 18
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Analyze Phases for timing. 3 R/W parcels, utilize exist part.
Project Team web site. Suggested increase LOS @ Snowhill
Donation of easement versus Gravel Wall. Pond 2A Co. Property
R/W Appraiser on team. Listed cost savings. 4.7 million
No mention of Ut use Pond.

Score 16
(0-20)

Ranking 2

Total Score (0-100) 88

**PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill
Road to the Orange County Line**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: URS

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Shad Smith

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

Excellent approach and use of Details. 2 sections. Excellent typical details
Show how exist Port can be used. Schedule supplied, 26 month total.
Excellent Detail of access and ideas. Met w/ OC but not widening
ECON River Discharge. 3 POND sites proposed.
Looked at two issues in regard to traffic Intersection. Detail of transition
of Rd to OC. Mention of utilities. List of 7 HOA & a Comm. Assoc.
Detail of Design not as complete. Lack detail in ROW research.
Missing some signal traffic analysis

Score 52
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Excellent similar project Experience and excellent project Team.
Jan and Ashraf experienced with Red Bug Project.
Exactly same team as Red Bug. Also, did Akoma in Oquirrh.

Score 20
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Defer 4/5aving S. of 44 Mills. Do Survey Data early to refine Design.
Create Web Site. Use exist ROW. Max use of exist Pav.

Score 15
(0-20)

Ranking 3

Total Score (0-100) 87

**PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill
Road to the Orange County Line**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: PEC

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Brett Blackadar

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: _____ (60)

Have 30% plans + R/W maps. Did lots of R/W research. Very good intersection analysis. Very good typical sections. Very thorough drainage analysis. Great graphics and very well rehearsed presentation which was well paced. Very good discussion of public information. Good answers to questions. The provided 30% plans + R/W maps looked great for a presentation. Very good landscaping discussion.

Score 55
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: _____ (20)

Proposed PM has recent experience w/ New Oxford Rd. Very good drainage staff. Did adjacent CR 419 project, Charlotte subdivision retrofits + many other Seminole County projects.

Score 19
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: _____ (20)

Do R/W Survey log first, w/P.E. Use County parcel for pond. Joint use pond w/church. Landscaping buffer in exchange for R/W. Re-use existing pavement. Several other ideas listed.

Score 18
(0-20)

Ranking 1

Total Score (0-100) 92

PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill
Road to the Orange County Line

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Metric Engineering, Inc

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Brett Blackadar

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: _____ (60)

Analyzed as two different segments. Good traffic analysis. Very good operation analysis at Snow Hill intersection. Paved easement on lane via Ed Bartfield on lieu of gravity walk. Good drainage analysis. Show several good alternatives. Provide public information package. Very good cost analysis. Good answers to questions.

Score 50
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: _____ (20)

Global S proposed for public implement. Ed Bartfield is sub. for Proj. Int is a good drainage sub. They have done several other Snow Hill County projects.

Score 19
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: _____ (20)

Only 3 R/W acquisitions for 4 ponds. Re-use existing pavement. Website Orange County + Metric. Joint-use ponds phase construction. Project information manual. Use Sm City property for pond. Other ideas also listed.

Score 17
(0-20)

Ranking 2

Total Score (0-100) 86

**PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill
Road to the Orange County Line**

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: URS

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Brett Blackadar

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: _____ (60)

*Good presentation graphics. Very good terminal section graphics + analysis.
Good step by step process. Good discussion of new SRW up
requirements. Good intersection discussion. Good transition
discussion. Provided very detailed schedule. Did not show
detailed proposed panel locations*

Score 48
(0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: _____ (20)

*Same team as 436 / Mt. Bug which has done a great
job. PM is very strong w/ public involvement.
Clinton, Roger is sub for RWA analysis. They also have
a lot of P&DT DS experience.*

Score 19
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: _____ (20)

*Do a project website. Reduce overall schedule by 24 months
Maximize use of existing roadway pavement. Early survey.
Some ideas listed are fairly general.*

Score 17
(0-20)

Ranking 3

Total Score (0-100) 84

PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill
Road to the Orange County Line

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: PEC

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Need Public Buy-in: Very detailed all covered issues
Project Approach: (60)

Extensive research & studies as well as
det. lnd survey. Stress rural character
Connect signal (Orange) - 20 cross (Snow Hill meet)
Most Road work already by PEC. No major
utility cuts needed. Good plan. Very
detailed on when need future improvement
Numerous typical developed & Urban section (Paved
median) to very good drainage permits
Detailed Public involvement Very good
Score 49.2
(0-60)

82

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Exp. staff - Numerous State / local
Projects - HHI part of team. The
d.d. Exhibit design standards
Score 79

Good (+4)

Score 15.8
(0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Numerous ideas covering
Rt. lane width - maybe raise some pavement
other

Good (+4)

Score 15.8
(0-20)

Ranking

Total Score (0-100) 80.8

PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill Road to the Orange County Line

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Metric Engineering, Inc

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

Define when project needed. 2 Public Meetings, 2 phases. Have done some early contact and provide well study information. No impact on power lines. Only ROW parcels. Identified all utilities. No impacts. 4 Business. No env. issues. Prefer raised median at north end. Contact book 80

Detailed in my answer Very good Score 48.0 (0-60)

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Exp. Staff. Numerous jobs. JMT does drainage 78

Good C+3 Score 15.6 (0-20)

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Reuse existing pavement. 3 ROW parcels (Paved). Paved from website. ROW approach 78

Good (C+3) Score 15.6 (0-20)

Ranking 2

Total Score (0-100) 79.2

PS-3556-08/JVP – Engineering and Design Services for CR419 from Snow Hill
Road to the Orange County Line

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: URS

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion up to the number of points allotted for each. The total number of points for all criterion will equal 100 points based on the following general guidelines:

- Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Please describe any strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment for each of the above stated evaluation criteria.

Project Approach: (60)

Trail
&
Landscape
also
Questions

15 Key issues. 3 step process to resolve
Traffic show can phone project. Various
typical. Detail process plan at north end.
Make 3 Road. Identify 5 bike holders
Can do Public Inv. Website
Covered most areas. Survey. Technical is
Key not covered in detail

Good (+4) Score 47.4
(0-60)

79

Qualifications of Proposed Team/Similar Work Experience: (20)

Exp. Staff. Numerous. State / Local
projects

Good (+3) Score 15.6
(0-20)

78

Innovation/Cost Savings Ideas: (20)

Can reuse some pavement. May get
some savings in price. Several ideas.

Good (+2) Score 15.4
(0-20)

77

Ranking 3

Total Score (0-100) 78.4